APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,107	07/09/2003	John C. Artz JR.	VIGN1460-1	1669

44654 7590 12/31/2007	**EXAMINER**
SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP	DUONG, OANH L
1301 W. 25TH STREET	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

SUITE 408
AUSTIN, TX 78705

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/616,107	ARTZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Oanh Duong	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/11/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cofino et al. ("Cofino"), US 6,996,536 Bb, in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA")

Regarding claim 1, Cofino teaches a method of associating requests and events comprising:

logging events at one or more servers (i.e., records shopper's navigation of the online store in web server log, col. 4 lines 37-39),

receiving a set of HTTP request data which includes, for each HTTP request in a set of HTTP requests, a request time stamp, and a string indicating said each HTTP request or a logical page corresponding to said each HTTP request (*i.e., receive a group of requests or a first web log entry, col. 4 lines 37-51, wherein each request including time stamp, col. 6 lines 54-59*);

receiving a set of event data which includes, for each of said logged events, an event time stamp and data corresponding to execution of one or more script (*i.e., a set of shopping steps such as click-throughs basket placement, and purchase, Fig. 6 line 57-col. 8 line 5*);

associating each of said logged events with a previous HTTP request from the set of HTTP requests that has a request time stamp being closest in time to the vent time stamp of the event (*a previous HTTP request such as search for production P2 at time-stamp T1 and events such a click-though A1 at time-stamp T1, Basket Placement A1 at time-stamp T8 and Purchase A1 at time-stamps T20. Those entries are associated in the first line of table 601 of Fig. 6 with time sequence order T1, T6, T8 and T20*).

Cofino does not explicitly teach initiation of said events includes generation of dynamic content according to one or more scripts at the one or more servers and activities initiated in response to a user's browsing behavior.

AAPA teaches initiation of said events includes generation of dynamic content according to one or more scripts at the one or more servers and activities initiated in response to a user's browsing behavior *(Fig. 1 page 4 paragraph [0007])*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Cofino to include initiation of said events includes generation of dynamic content according to one or more scripts at the one or more servers and activities initiated in response to a user's browsing behavior as taught by AAPA because it was conventionally employed in the art to allow dynamic content to be generated and communicated to client computer.

Regarding claim 2, Cofino teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising time ordering the set of HTTP requests and time ordering the set of events *(i.e., requests are sorted by timestamp, col. 6 lines 61-62)*.

Regarding claim 3, Cofino teaches the method of claim 1, wherein at least one of said logged events is an application event *(col. 6 lines 49-53)*.

Regarding claim 4, Cofino teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the at least one application event includes the generation of dynamic content for a web page *(col. 6 lines 49-53)*.

Regarding claim 5, Cofino teaches a method for associating requests with events comprising:

logging events at one or more servers (i.e., records shopper's navigation of the online store in web server log, col. 4 lines 37-39),

receiving a set of HTTP request data representing one or more HTTP requests associated with one or more users, which includes, for each HTTP request in a set of HTTP requests, a request user identifier, a request time stamp, and a string indicating said each HTTP request or a logical page corresponding to said each HTTP request (col. 10 lines 35-43);

receiving a set of event data representing one or more events associated with one or more users, which includes, for each of said logged events, an user identifier (i.e., session/shopper ID), an event time stamp , and data corresponding to execution of said one or more script *(Fig. 6 col. 7line 14-col. 8 line 5)*;

determining a set of HTTP requests associated with a first user from the one or more HTTP requests based on the request user identifiers (col. 7 lines 16-27);

determining a set of events associated with the first user from the said logged events based on the event user identifiers (col. 7 lines 28-56); and

associating the set of events associated with first user and the set of HTTP requests associated with the first user based on the event time stamp for each of the set of events associated with the first user and the event time stamp for each of the set of HTTP requests associated with the first user (i.e., session S1 or first user, Fig. 6 col. 7 lines 16-col. 8 line 19).

Cofino does not explicitly teach initiation of said events includes generation of dynamic content according to one or more scripts at the one or more servers and activities initiated in response to a user's browsing behavior.

AAPA teaches initiation of said events includes generation of dynamic content according to one or more scripts at the one or more servers and activities initiated in response to a user's browsing behavior *(Fig. 1 page 4 paragraph [0007])*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Cofino to include initiation of said events includes generation of dynamic content according to one or more scripts at the one or more servers and activities initiated in response to a user's browsing behavior as taught by AAPA because it was conventionally employed in the art to allow dynamic content to be generated and communicated to client computer.

Regarding claim 6, Cofino teaches the method of Claim 5, wherein associating the set of events associated with the first user and the set of HTTP request associated with the first user comprises associating each event of the set of events associated with the first user with a previous HTTP request that has a request time stamp being closest in time to the event time stamp of the event (i.e., micro-conversion table for session S1, T, T3, T10, T12, Fig. 6 col. 7 lines 28-56).

Regarding claim 7, Cofino teaches the method of Claim 6, wherein in the event time stamp for each event and the request time stamp for each HTTP request are generated by synchronized clocks (col. 6 lines 59-61).

Regarding claim 8, Cofino teaches the method of Claim 6, wherein at least one event of the one or more events is an application event *(col. 6 lines 49-53).*

Regarding claim 9, Cofino teaches he method of Claim 8, wherein the at least one application event includes the generation of dynamic content for a web page *(col. 6 lines 49-53).*

Regarding claim 10, Cofino teaches the method of Claim 8, wherein the one or more events includes only application events (Fig. 11).

Regarding claims 11-16, those claims does recite or define any new limitation above claims 5-10, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 18-20, those claims does not recite or define any new limitation above claims 1-4, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3983. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 9:30PM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Oanh Duong/
Primary Examiner
December 26, 2007